

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 3, 10, 11, 14-16, 24-26, 28, 29, 31-34, and 36 (including the non-elected claims) have been canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer). Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 have been canceled to improve their form, clarity, and readability. Independent claims 5, 13, and 18 also have been amended to further define the invention. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 5-8, 13-16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Leong (USP 5,513,342). Claims 1-3, 9-11, 17, 35, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Leong in view of McKnight (USPGP 2005/0086613). Claims 19-23 [and 27-31] were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Leong in view of Rodden (USPGP 2002/0191026). Finally, claims 7 and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Leong in view of Ishida (USP 5,684,969). Applicant traverses these rejections at least to the extent that the applied references would not have disclosed or taught controlling the window sizing as set forth in independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17-19, and 27.

Independent claims 5, 13, and 18 each call for controlling a display device to display a plurality of windows including a plurality of video windows and an operation panel window. At least one of the video windows displays an image based on image data output from a video device. The operation panel window displays an operation panel for controlling the video device. These claims further call for changing the size and the display position of the operation panel window corresponding to the video windows in accordance with the size changing of the selected one of the video windows.

Leong discloses automatically adjusting and updating the sizes of child windows to accommodate the change in the font size. See column 4, lines 22-39, Figs. 3-5, and column 4, lines 52-57. First, Leong does not disclose or teach any video window for displaying an image from a video device. Second, Leong does not disclose or teach an operation panel window for controlling a video device. Third, Leong fails to disclose or teach a corresponding size

relationship between the video window and the operation panel window. Accordingly, Leong would not have anticipated or rendered obvious independent claims 5, 13, and 18.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 each call for storing selection history information for each of the windows selected in a storage and changing the size of each of the window display sections based on the selection history information stored in the storage, in response to selection of one of the windows. In rejecting these claims, the examiner relied upon McKnight for the proposition that changing the size of the window display section based on stored history information of each window display section would have been obvious. McKnight, however, does not disclose anywhere that its persistent usage context operation stores any window display sizes. Accordingly, applicant submits that Leong and McKnight, even if they were deemed properly combinable for argument's sake, would not have taught claims 1, 9, and 17.

Independent claims 19 and 27 each call for moving a selected one of the windows in the indicated movement direction, and displaying the selected one window at an enlarged size that is larger size than all of the non-selected windows. In rejecting these claims, the examiner relied upon Rodden for the proposition that moving the selected window display section based on the movement direction of the selected window display section would have been obvious. Claims 19 and 27, however, do not merely call for moving the window display section. Indeed, these claims call for enlarging the selected window display section to a size larger than any of the non-selected window display sections. As neither Leong nor Rodden would have disclosed or taught this aspect of the claimed invention, these claims patentably define over Leong and Rodden (even if they were deemed properly combinable for argument's sake).

Dependent claims 7 and 15 each call for changing the number of operating buttons of the operation panel window in accordance with the size change of the selected window. The examiner relied upon the passage of Ishida set forth in column 8, lines 26-64, to reject these claims. This passage, however, states nothing about changing the number of operating buttons of the operation panel window. Rather, it merely discloses scaling down the displayed window section. Note that Ishida also does not disclose a separate operation panel window, let alone a video window. Accordingly, applicant submits that the combination (Leong and Ishida) would not have taught the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17-23, 27, 30, and 35 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

05 JULY 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)